DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 841 95 EA 007 902

TITLE Hierarchy, Power, and Women in Educational Policy Making. A Position Paper Prepared by the National Conference on Women in Educational Policy Making. IEL Report 6.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO IEL-R-6
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 28p.; Related documents are EA 007 903-904

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; Affirmative Action; Change Strategies; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Females; Feminism; Leadership Styles; Leadership Training; Organization; *Policy Formation; *Power Structure; Principals; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Stereotypes; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

Education is the crucial institution involved in sex-role socialization. The percentage of women in school administrative positions has declined. Schools have adopted modern corporation and military management models. Women unhappy about the status quo must learn about power, both theoretically and practically, in order to change their position in the world of education and find the tools for institutional change within the schools. Women can (1) collect the qualifications necessary to be a legitimate contender for a place in the school power hierarchy; (2) summarize the research negating that administration is a male job; and (3) if necessary file legal complaints. Women in administration can provide a much-needed service by becoming participant observers and compiling handbooks and case studies of real experiences with power structures and leadership styles. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIERARCHY, POWER, AND WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING

LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-9061

IEL REPORTS: SIX

Second Printing
OCTOBER 1975

ED117841
EA 007 902

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON – DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

K.Z. CHAVIS
Program Director
Leadership Development Program, Atlanta

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President, Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Director
United Teachers' Los Angeles Urban Project

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, House Education Committee
Hartford, Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

DR. LOUIS H. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JOHN PITTENGER
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

HONORABLE MARY RIEKE
Oregon State Representative

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD C. SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DR. CHARLES WATTS
President
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

INSTITUTE STAFF

SAMUEL HALPERIN – Director
DIETRA ROGERS – Chief Administrative Officer
JUNE FRANK – Budget Officer

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
GEORGE LANE – Director
SHARON ENRIGHT – Associate Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
JAMES BROWNE – Coordinator

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER – Director

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW – Executive Producer

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
KENNETH C. FISCHER – Director

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION
ALICE G. SARGENT – Coordinator

CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT
GEORGE KAPLAN – Coordinator

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education"
over National
Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

HIERARCHY, POWER, AND WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING

A Position Paper Prepared by the
National Conference on Women
in Educational Policy Making

Leadership Training Institute
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 833-9051

IEL REPORTS: SIX OCTOBER 1975

Distribution of this report is made possible by a contract with the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Leadership Training Institute (LTI) on educational leadership is an outgrowth of the 1969 Federal Education Professions Development Act. During the past five years the LTI has been concerned with a broad range of issues in educational leadership with particular emphasis on the development of internship programs in Six City-University Projects funded by USOE which have experimented extensively with the preparation and training of future educational leaders.

In its quest for more effective educational leadership, the LTI recognized in the early stages of its work the serious sparsity of Blacks, Spanish-Speaking, and American Indians within the ranks of educational leadership. One of our major objectives was to encourage the recruitment of minority candidates for our internship programs. In 1973 the LTI initiated several conferences to examine and evaluate the status of minorities in the area of school administration. A representative and distinguished group of leaders from each minority group was assembled and each group in turn planned the nature of its conference, the agenda, and its participants.

By 1973, the LTI recognized that in its preoccupation with greater representation in school administration by Blacks, Spanish-Speaking, and American Indians, we had neglected women, the group making up the largest portion of the education professions especially as teachers. A separate conference by women was therefore planned.

As one looks back at the 1960's and early 1970's, the ancient truism reappears -- that despite centuries or decades of oppression and stereotyping -- society still does not recognize that equality of opportunity, like liberty, is indivisible. When discrimination is practiced against any single individual or group, no one can be assured of equal treatment. As was the case with other victims of discrimination, women had to wage their own battle to gain equal treatment. Hopefully, the findings and recommendations developed by the various groups will awaken the educational bureaucracy to still existing, but disregarded injustices in other areas of the broad educational field. In schools, equal opportunity and treatment are not merely democratic issues, but the very touchstone of sound educational practice.

This publication is a statement developed by the conference on Women in Educational Policy Making held in Denver, Colorado, January, 1974. The Leadership Training Institute is very grateful to the members of the conference for their significant contribution to education and the area of school leadership. These findings and recommendations will be disseminated within the education professions and among those governmental agencies that are instrumental in shaping educational policy.

The LTI is especially grateful to Ms. Margery Thompson, who, as conference coordinator, writer and editor, has prepared the material, including this publication, which emerged from this conference.

Norman Drachler,
Director, Leadership
Training Institute

George R. Kaplan
Associate Director,
Leadership Training
Institute

This work was developed under a grant from the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that Agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.

This booklet grew out of discussions in the following group concerned with understanding the politics of career advancement:

Florence Howe - Group Leader
John McCluskey - position paper
Marilyn Neidig
Eileen M. Kelly
Elizabeth C. Wilson

It was written and edited by Florence Howe, John McCluskey, and Elizabeth Wilson.

A complete list of the Conference planning committee, participants and their affiliations is contained in Appendix A.

HIERARCHY, POWER, AND WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY MAKING

> *A major portion of the women's movement has been suspicious of power and leadership. Even the words have been anathema. The movement speaks of leaderless consciousness-raising groups and of male power structures. To be a feminist has often meant to discard traditional routes to power and to efface oneself into the leaderless or nonauthoritarian group. And yet, of course, the exercise of power and influence are involved in almost all relationships among people in groups and institutions. Even the apparently leaderless group has leaders, as many of us have come to recognize.*
>
> *We think it is important for feminists in general and for women in educational leadership in particular to look carefully at patterns of power in leadership, both as they exist in educational institutions and as they exist in the women's movement and in other contemporary social movements for change. Because we believe that education is the crucial institution involved in sex-role socialization, we also believe that women in positions of educational leadership should understand both the high risks they may have to take and the significant accomplishments they may achieve.*

What is The Problem?

"Curiouser and curiouser," said Lewis Carroll's Alice, as she observed the disappearance of her feet beneath her. Her sisters today could well be making the same remark as they observe their diminishing hold on power and policy-making in the schools. Only yesterday the elementary school world belonged almost exclusively to women. Only yesterday we were pointing with pride to our mothers and grandmothers who had a toehold, however precarious, on leadership

What has happened to this brave beginning? Why, to take an especially shocking example, has the percentage of women elementary school principals declined "at the rate of two percent per year" in the very recent past (1958-68)? (So says Dorothy L. Johnson in "Ms. Administrators, Where Are They?", School Administrator Newsletter, American Association of School Administrators (AASA), August 1972.) These were years characterized by growing unrest, upheavals, and protest on the part of many groups hungry for status and power: the blacks, the young, the poor, the teachers. Where was the woman school leader during this period? Why has she permitted the woman elementary school principal to become an almost extinct creature?

It is a curious phenomenon--one not easily dispelled by pat answers about the successful recruiting of men into elementary schools, or speculation about the Freudian image of women as essentially submissive and nurturing rather than aggressive and conceptualizing. Our guess is that not enough attention has been paid to changes in the organization and power structure of the school as an institution. These were, we must remember, the vintage years of The Great Society. They were the years of hope and ferment--the years when we believed we knew how to take care of our social and educational ills, given some money and large doses of existing expertise in the form of new curriculums, new organizational patterns, new amalgams of students, and new management systems.

The public schools rather suddenly became socially and economically important in ways not fully exploited in previous decades. They were not only to become the vehicles of social change; they were also involved in the processing of a product intimately related to the economic well-being of the nation and to the GNP. Large corporations like IBM and Xerox lurked in the background, ready to spring into the driver's seat in place of the bumbling educator who did not understand the administration of big business.

School board members jumped up and down about modern information systems, data processing, PPB (Planning, Programming, Budgeting--the McNamara management system), and about curriculum systems of input, output, and feedback. Small school districts were consolidated in the interests of a greater variety of services and greater efficiency.

Much emphasis was placed on the acquisition of instructional hardware, such as overhead projectors and TV sets. The government gave giant sums of money for research and development centers--in universities and in newly formed educational laboratories--to bring to the schools the benefit of new knowledge and new techniques in curriculum and instruction.

In short, there was and is a deliberate and continuing effort to move the school's administration and management from that of a cottage industry or small factory to that of a modern corporation.

Parallel with the remaking of school administration and management practices have been two kinds of personnel trends that are not unrelated to the attempt to streamline managerial structures. One that has been mentioned already is the flight of the female from positions of leadership. The other is the unionization of teachers. Indeed, we suspect that these trends are more pronounced in the bigger and more up-to-date systems. That is to say, the more the school system's methods of governance look like that of big business, and the better the salary scale, the fewer the number of women leaders and the more powerful and vocal the union. One large system we know has openly articulated the need to get rid of the middle-aged, motherly principal and to replace her with the slick, upwardly-mobile young man, eager to innovate, able to speak the language of the computer, and responsive to the demands of the power structure.

Another phenomenon worth noting is that the corporate model of policy and decision making most usual in the modernized school and school system is a military one.

Again, this is not surprising in view of the fact that the military model is the single most usual "other" managerial experience of present-day school leaders. Nor is it any surprise that most of the people with military experience in the school are men.

The leadership style of the armed forces is impersonal and authoritarian. It has to be: its mission is war. The organizational structure of the military is notoriously hierarchical and complicated, as befits the need to design, support, and run the complex technology of the modern military machine. The ideal leadership style and the structure of the corporate body of the armed forces fit its mission. Its institutional means and ends are internally consistent.

But therein lies the rub. The mission of the school as an institution is just about as different from that of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as it can be. Instead of quick striking power with death and destruction its goal, the school seeks a slow, long-range, cumulative effect on individuals and on groups of individuals toward competence in basic academic skills and knowledge, toward a desire to go on learning after formal education is completed, toward independence, self-esteem, and self-confidence. The educational goals articulated by schools at all levels of learning may be impossibly global and ideal, but they are designed to enhance and enrich life--to help people acquire the internal power to guide and control their lives and that of the society in which they live. That the schools have not succeeded in their mission for all of the children of all of the people need not be elaborated here. The task is extraordinarily difficult, as even our critics are beginning to discover after the last faint trumpets of the Reform Movement fade in the distance.

And surely the administration and management of the schools need better organization and leadership than they have ever enjoyed. Nor do we believe that a massive return to the warm, motherly, little red school house or the fragmentation of public school governments into tiny autonomous units are realistic answers to the problem. Indeed, the military establishment and the large private corporations (especially the latter) have accumulated a wealth of technique and knowledge that school people must study and understand.

The difficulty has been the wholesale lifting of a "foreign" power system from the military and the large corporate bureaucracies without attention to the essential differences in the goals of the several organizations. With the crunch, the school loses some of its most important assets. For instance, the warmth and intimacy of some long-term personal relationships. For instance, women in leadership positions. We are reminded of Emerson's remark that ends preexist in means, and thus that full-scale adoption of military or corporate power structures as unexamined means can and will have unholy effect upon the educational ends of the school.

The management of power for liberating, humane ends is an extraordinarily complex and virtually unexplored field, both in design and execution. Designing a liberating power structure and leadership style for the school--any school--will take all the brains and commitment we can muster. It is essential, therefore, that women who are unhappy about the status quo begin to learn something about power, both theoretically and practically. Not only may they then be able to change their position in the world of education, but they may also find the tools for institutional change within the schools and join the movement crying for seasoned recruits.

What Is Power?

Power is to social action and groups as water is to nature: a basic source of life and vitality. Wisely used, it can nourish the talents, qualities, and lives of all people regardless of sex; abused, it can damage and destroy those precious qualities, aspirations, and lives. Power is a major element in the present educational system's inequities toward women, as well as a potential vehicle for vast, liberating changes for women and men.

As we have shown, the present male-dominated power structure in education is increasingly geared to the efficiency of systems analysis and the hierarchical command of the corporation or military organization. It is hardly surprising to assert that policymaking, confined to very few, needs to be changed. Changing the way in which the power to make decisions is organized in educational institutions

is a major problem not only for those striving for equal rights and opportunities in education, but also for the health and well-being of society itself.

Equally essential is the need to change the style or manner by which people in schools exercise power. For, contrary to much popular and scholarly opinion, the exercise of power and influence can bring about beneficial changes in people, rather than harmful ones. Power relations do not need to consist of domination and control by one person or a group over others. Indeed, people may exercise power without dominating and controlling others at all. Instead, they may intentionally elicit liberating changes in others. For the sake of human liberation, new styles of power and leadership must replace the authoritarian and controlling ones prevalent today in educational institutions.

Power or influence is exercised when one person or group gets another to change in ways that have been deliberately conceived; that is, when one person elicits desired responses from another. When John gets Jim to do something Jim would not otherwise do, John is exercising power. In school systems, power is exercised when a teacher gets students to change in ways the teacher intends: they learn to read more accurately, for example, or dance more gracefully. Likewise, power and influence are exercised when an administrator gets a group of teachers to adopt a new set of instructional materials. And when a group of parents gets a superintendent to give serious attention to the issue of sexual stereotyping in the school curriculum, they too are exercising power.

New Forms of Power Relationships

Our focus is on the person at whom the power is being directed, "the target." Obviously, people may be influenced for better or for worse; obviously, too, there are two matters involved in the relationship between the powerful and the person who feels the source of that power. The first is simply the result: is it beneficial to the target or not, and how beneficial or how harmful? If, through the power of one person, another person changes in ways that increase his self-esteem, independence, awareness,

aspiration, and efficacy at some skill or valued activity, then the relationship has been a liberating one. If on the other hand, the changes accomplished are harmful to a person's self-esteem, independence, efficacy, and so on, the relationship has been a debilitating one.

In extreme forms, power relationships can be so enabling and confirming to those being influenced that they become emancipating. In liberation movements, people are often profoundly changed by leaders and peers with whom they struggle collectively: they develop power where they were powerless, independence where they were dependent, awareness where they were ignorant, hope where they knew despair, self-confidence where they felt self-doubt, and a self-esteem that allows people to walk proudly and beautifully where they had stooped and shuffled. As black people in Montgomery, Alabama, who had fought with Martin Luther King declared, "We have given up childish ways to become men."

Unfortunately, the typical power relationships in educational institutions are not liberating but debilitating. Unfortunately, many people, especially students, are adversely affected by the power relationships inside our schools. From preschool through graduate school, students are often influenced to act out sexually stereotyped and humanly restrictive roles. If they are female, they discover that the responses adults desire from them are designed to influence them to become mommies not managers, nurses not neurosurgeons, consumers not corporation heads, secretaries not senators. They are taught to make coffee not policy, to bake bread, not build bridges. If they are male, they are taught quite differently--to be tough, not tender.

One result of this incessant process is that young people are taught to accept restrictive and often demeaning roles, relationships, and activities. In addition, if they are female, many of these roles and activities are devalued, even degraded. In short, the adults in our educational system, particularly those in positions of leadership, often exercise a debilitating power on students, stunting their aspiration, independence, self-esteem, and efficacy.

Yet this is utterly contrary to the goals of education, if we are to take seriously the traditional rhetoric. To educate is to enable others to learn; to help them develop their efficacy or skill at various tasks, their awareness of or knowledge about various topics, and their ability to take the initiative in pursuing new experiences. Properly stated, the goals of education demand that teachers exercise liberating power upon students.

If an authoritarian style of power and leadership, set within a hierarchical and corporate structure, is in fact debilitating and stunting our students, what new styles of power and leadership must we develop to move closer to liberating them? What methods of exercising power must we adopt in order to achieve more effectively the stated goals of education?

First, we might ask ourselves whether the person exercising power is enabling the person being influenced to obtain valuable and desirable goals and values more effectively. Is an English teacher who allows her students to write only analytical, expository essays enabling those students to develop their poetic and expressive capabilities?

Second, we might ask outselves whether the person exercising power is confirming the person being influenced. One person confirms another when her actions indicate to the latter that their beliefs about who the latter is correspond. For example, a woman teacher can confirm an adolescent girl by urging her to adopt a positive self-identity to which she has privately aspired but which others had not encouraged. Perhaps the teacher is the first adult to advise and thereby encourage the student to pursue a professional career, while others had expected much more limited aspirations from her.

Third, we might ask ourselves whether the person exercising power is abstaining from controlling the other person's access to rewards. Does the power agent play the role of "gatekeeper," restricting other people's access to rewards unless they do what the gatekeeper wants them to do? Or does the power agent play the role of "broadcaster of facts and values," sharing resources or rewards unconditionally, or sharing information others need to obtain rewards, without requiring compliance in return?

This is an especially critical feature in distinguishing forms of power. The "gatekeeper" uses the "carrot and stick" method to exercise power: holding out carrots (promising rewards) if subordinates will comply with the leader's goal, and shaking sticks (threatening punishments) if subordinates will not comply. Commonly used by those in positions of leadership, this is a controlling style of power. It is manifest in the principal who gets a faculty to adopt a new set of instructional materials because he dangles the carrot of lighter teaching loads if the teachers will comply and threatens the punishment of the same old teaching load if they do not.

It is possible, on the other hand, to exercise power without being a "gatekeeper" to others' rewards, to abandon control and domination entirely, by exercising "exemplary power." Then the power agent sets an example or demonstrates a course of action without promising rewards or threatening punishment. When people simply set examples, they may be sharing rewards unconditionally with the people they are trying to influence, or sharing the information needed to pursue goals and rewards. Thus we might ask how effectively educational leaders set examples of values they want others to share, or how effectively they demonstrate skills or procedures they want others to learn. Does a high school drama teacher help develop the vocal and acting abilities of his students by threatening them with punishments and frightening them with the potential embarrassment of a poor opening night's performance, or does he, rather, set before them positive examples of voice and stage movement from which they may learn to develop a confident stage presence?

Finally, we may ask ourselves whether the person exercising power is getting others to adopt changes that are intrinsically <u>rewarding</u> to them. A teacher who succeeds at overcoming students' reluctance to engage in activities that turn out to be extremely valuable is eliciting such intrinsically rewarding changes in them. Perhaps the teacher gets them to become fully engrossed in the exhilerating experience of performing a beautiful dance or musical piece. Perhaps it is the accomplishment of some highly valued intellectual or practical task, in which the student derives great self-respect and a feeling of efficacy. In any case, the growth of self-esteem, independence, aspiration, and self-confidence in the person on whom power is exercised will depend on just such intrinsically rewarding experiences.

This growth in the learning of others is, as we have seen, the essence of good teaching. But good teachers, like able students, are often diverted from the exercise of positive power relationships by the climate of the institution in which they work: the school, the educational system, or the university. Perhaps the most potent way to change student-teacher power relationships is to change the teacher-administrator relationship within the school or school system. Such a change, of course, means changing the generally accepted power structures and leadership styles within the institution.

This is a tough nut to crack, particularly from the lowly position of most women in the educational hierarchy. What is to be done? Where can potential women leaders move from here?

What Does it all Mean for Women Trying to Change the System?

By and large, women are at the bottom of the educational world. Their advantage lies in their numbers: were they all to make waves, the tide might turn and engulf the present power structure. But on the whole, it is a single woman or a small group who provide the current, and it is clear enough that they take a great risk in so doing. The dimensions of that risk depend both on the job security of activists and on the willingness of friendly "buffers"--women and men in positions of power--to shield them. The junior school administrator or assistant professor on a campus who insists, for example, that a special effort be made to recruit women and minorities may herself need protection from the ire of chiefs who prefer the route of the "old boy's club."

It is not clear how much conscious tightening at the top of the power structure there has been, but it is perfectly obvious that we have already elicited sufficient backlash to frighten some women and silence others. And yet, of course, the presence of backlash is a reminder of the movement's power. To retreat in the face of backlash is to forget that power and to give up at the moment when the opposition is feeling that power and reacting to it.

But what should women do? Press harder on the issues that are vulnerable. For example, it is obvious that if administrators were truly interested in the health of

school systems or in the excellence of teachers being trained at schools of education, they would look for talent to the vast and largely untapped pool of women teachers and graduate students. Empirical data of many kinds will verify that talent: academic records in college, graduate school examinations, and several complex recent studies all indicate that women's talent in the area of administration (surprisingly) surpasses men's. Summarize the research; popularize the findings: the first job is to crack the myth that administration is a male job.

The second issue is the legal one: it is simply against the law to discriminate against women who would or could be administrators. Flood the power structure with readable documentation. Again, if reason--in the form of literature and talk--won't work, then the filing of complaints will have to follow.

But the major task is still to come, for some women are not interested in merely being hired to do the job as it has been done for decades. They want to change that job significantly, both in style and in substance. A woman principal might decide to organize a council of teachers to evaluate existing textbooks and suggest changes. She might use her power in the liberating ways suggested earlier in this pamphlet because she is interested in changing the ways in which both women and men think of themselves and work with each other in educational institutions. Such changed administrators and teachers might be very different kinds of people when next they meet with and influence students. In short, the woman administrator interested in change will need to learn to use power in a new way to effect those substantial changes she is after.

What Is the Curriculum?

If women are to prepare themselves to become educational policy makers, and if, even more important, they are to use such leadership positions to change the system, what will they study? Of what will the curriculum consist? Who will be the teachers? Where is the graduate school?

The place to begin is to learn about power, for knowledge about power is the first step to power itself. Women can start by systematic study of the phenomenon both

through the traditional means of books and classes and through careful observation of the live creature in situ, that is, from within the schools and universities themselves.

On the traditional front, a fascinating body of literature is accumulating--a cross-disciplinary amalgam of such subjects as political science, social psychology, industrial management, and so on. Scholars are beginning to get interested in collecting hard-headed case studies from industry, government, and education--case studies that can be used as data sources for new concepts of leadership styles and internal governance patterns for large social institutions and for governmental and industrial bureaucracies. This literature is provocative and hopeful about the possibility of flattening internal power hierarchies and developing realistic forms of participatory democracy.

Women who are trying to change the system must have command of existing knowledge in the field. The brief look at power provided earlier in this essay is a sample from this growing field of knowledge. It will serve, we hope, to whet the appetite of tomorrow's Great Women Experts in new leadership styles and power structures for education. This knowledge can be found in selected colleges and universities, often outside the formal graduate schools of education and teachers' colleges.

But this curriculum for would-be experts in educational power not only requires a scholarly command of subject matter, it also insists upon a practicum in the art of politics in the real school world--preferably at several levels, from kindergarten through university. The first part of the practicum is concerned with collecting the qualifications necessary to be a legitimate contender for a place in the school power hierarchy. For many well-educated, upper-middle-class women, this means paying no attention to the traditional liberal arts disdain for courses in "education," regardless of how mediocre they may be. In addition, it means dropping the "Lady Bountiful" stance toward the public schools. Even when the schools were in dire need of warm bodies to "keep school," they quite properly rejected the "good works" aura exuded by many would-be leaders. Today these attitudes won't get a woman in the front door, much less into a position to be seriously in the running for a leadership post.

For large numbers of women, then, whatever their class or caste, qualifying oneself for educational leadership demands more seriousness of purpose, and more persistence, than many have been willing to give to the enterprise. What happens while able women wait around to gear themselves up? Why, along comes the ambitious young man, of course, who quickly puts in the classroom time required to learn the trade, collects all the credits deemed essential by the certifying agencies (no matter how boring or irrelevant the courses), and very soon pops up as the boss. Women are sometimes their own worst enemies when it comes to jumping through the qualifying hoops set up by the educational establishment.

A second step in the practicum should take place during the qualifying apprenticeship described above, and, in fact, during the entire professional lifetime of the woman leader. This part of the practicum asks that the student not only live in an institution and actively participate in its functioning, but that she become an expert participant-observer of the way the institution behaves.

And what precisely does becoming a professional participant-observer imply? It means cultivating the ability to stand outside oneself and one's immediate experience to describe, to analyze, and to interpret it for others. It suggests assuming the posture of a resident anthropologist, observing and documenting the manners and mores of a familiar educational institution in the same way the anthropologist studies the culture of faraway and esoteric peoples.

Learning one's art can be demanding, but it can also be fun. It is fun to be caught up in the triumphs, rivalries, and passions that are the lifeblood of power. It can be very heady wine. And the requirement that one later articulates one's feelings and observations with a degree of objectivity and even with a sense of the absurd may be sobering, but it can also, in a quieter vein, be equally absorbing.

Able women are particularly well suited to the job of being resident anthropologists in our educational institutions. Having been excluded from most of the power positions, they have little investment in the present power structures and do not need to be defensive about them. Furthermore,

women seem to have built-in natural interests in the health and welfare of our educational institutions. That these institutions are feeble and sick now goes without saying. If they are to renew themselves and assume the powerful place they should have in the ongoing life of our society, then we need to know in which directions they should move and how to move them.

Compiling observers' handbooks and case studies of real experiences with power structures and leadership styles is, therefore, a much-needed service. There are very few studies of the complexities of change in the school world. We have plenty of literature denouncing the system. We have ivory tower ideas about change that either boomerang in practice or have not yet stood the test of battle. We don't need more people telling us what is the matter. We do, however, desperately need to know what to do about it--what remedies work and what do not.

The venture is not for the faint-hearted. Anyone really working at changing the establishment is bound to be in trouble much of the time. And leaders who are successful in even a small way are usually in big trouble. Policy-making bodies in schools and universities are already nervous about the potential advance of women beyond the token level, up the ladder of power and into the inner sanctums of governance. Add to this uneasiness the possibility of rocking the boat--of reordering the base on which power is built by the establishment--and it is not difficult to see how hot the political kitchen can become for any leader, male or female. In this respect, women are simply in double jeopardy.

Various corporate groups should seriously consider the systematic development of protective agencies for the potential crusader. Perhaps a new form of benevolent insurance company should be created to serve as a psychological and monetary security blanket for those who get burned or get burned out. And who will absorb some of these risks with the adventurer? Teachers unions? Women's caucuses? Answers to this question as well as consideration of the form this insurance should take are good topics for another essay.

But while the risks of becoming a crusader are real, there are also many real compensations. Being a participant-observer of the life and hard times of our educational institutions can be an extraordinarily interesting undertaking.

So can using this knowledge and experience to create new power structures and leadership styles more consistent with the goals of an educational institution.

It is high time women began the serious study of power in the schools. Those who take this route to the exercise of power will find themselves engulfed by one of the greatest problems of our time. The task can be exhilerating as well as demanding, intrinsically rewarding as well as exhausting. And there is an exciting and growing group of people to offer companionship along this unexplored road.

APPENDIX A

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING
DENVER, COLORADO
JANUARY 23-25, 1974

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Ms. Cecilia Cosca
U.S. Civil Rights Commission
1121 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 401
Washington, DC

Ms. Arvonne Fraser, President
Women's Equity Action League
National Press Building, Room 538
Washington, DC 20004

Ms. Anne Grant
NOW-Education Committee
28 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022

Ms. Margaret Jones
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1507 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Elizabeth Koontz
Coordinator for Nutritional
Programs
North Carolina State Department
of Human Resources
Albemarle Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Ms. Carmen Maymi, Director
Women's Bureau
U.S. Department of Labor
14th and Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20010

Ms. Shirley McCune
Manager, Teacher Rights Division
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Gail T. McLure
American College Testing Program
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. John McLure
Department of Education
408 Jefferson Building
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Ms. Terry Saaric
The Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd Street
New York, New York

Ms. Joan Thompson
Federal Women's Program
Office of Education, Room 2049
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Yvonne M. Agazarian
Savi Communications
1831 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

Ms. Sally V. Allen, Director
Early Childhood Project
Education Commission of the
States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Jean L. Ambrose
Assistant to Dean
Douglass College and Chairperson
Women's Rights Task Force on
Education of New Jersey N.O.W.
549 Lenox Avenue
Westfield, New Jersey 07090

Susan Groves Bement, Director
Woman's Studies Program
Berkeley Unified School District
1720 Oregon Street
Berkeley, California 94703

Ms. Marj Britt
Director of Curriculum Development
The Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, New York 11568

Ms. Gwyneth Britton
Assistant Professor
School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Blandina (Bambi) Cardenas
Vice-Chairperson
NEA, Human Relations Council
Vice-President
Inter-Cultural Laboratories
San Antonio, Texas

Dr. Patricia Chesebro
Associate Professor of Psychology
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Constance E. Cook
Member of New York State Assembly
Chairwoman
Assembly Education Committee
209 Coy Glen Road
Ithaca, New York 14850

Margaret C. Dunkle
Project Associate
Project on the Status &
Education of Women
Association of American
Colleges
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Ms. Catherine East
Executive Secretary
Citizens Advisory Council on the
Status of Women
Department of Labor Building
Room 1236
Washington, DC 20210

Judith B. Edwards
Research Assistant
Iowa Testing Program
220 Lindquist Center for
Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Dr. Cecilia Foxley (position paper)
Affirmative Action Program
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Mrs. Jessie Gomez Franco
Assistant Principal
Instruction and Curriculum
Nightingale Junior High School
3311 North Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California

Margaret Gates
Co-Director
Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, Suite 508
Washington, DC 20036

Mrs. Karen A. Hone
Administrative Assistant
Education Commission
of the States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Florence Howe
Professor of Humanities
Suny-College at Old Westbury
President, The Feminist Press
and the Clearinghouse on
Women's Studies
Editor, The Women's Studies
Newsletter
Box 210
Westbury, L.I., New York 11568

Ms. Margaret Jones
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1507 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Joyce Kaser
Chairer, Dayton Schools
Women's Rights Committee, 1972-73
348 West First Street
Room 1473 Annex
Dayton, Ohio

Dr. Eileen Kelly
Associate in Education Research
New York State Education Department
Coordinator, New York State National
Organization for Women
98 South Pine Avenue
Albany, New York 12208

Ms. Lourdes Miranda King
President
L. Miranda and Associates
3502 Taylor Street
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015

Dr. John McLure
Department of Education
408 Jefferson Building
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Holly Knox
Director
Project on Equal Education
Rights (PEER)
1522 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Martha Matthews
Project Coordinator
Resource Center on Sex Roles
in Education
National Foundation for the
Improvement of Education
1156 - 15th Street, NW, Suite 9
Washington, DC 20005

Ms. Lucile Musmanno
Research Associate
Education Finance Project
Research and Information Service
Education Commission of the Stat
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Sharon L. Menard
National Organization for
Women
Educational Task Force
Boulder Chapter
Colorado N.O.W.
State Board Member
2348 North 107 Street
Lafayette, Colorado 80026

Dr. Shirley McCune
Manager, Teacher Rights
National Education Association
1201 - 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. John McClusky
Department of Political Science
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Dr. Marilyn B. Neidig
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

Dr. Ruth M. Oltman
Dean of Graduate Program
Hood College
Frederick, Maryland 21701

Ms. Virginia Paul
Reading Specialist
Clover Park School District
11701 Interlaaken Drive, SW
Tacoma, Washington 98498

Carolyn I. Polowy
Attorney; Legal Head-Women's Equity Action League
Consultant to the Center for Women Policy Studies
2000 P Street, NW, Suite 508
Washington, DC 20036

Pam Root
Associate Supervisor
Equal Educational Opportunity
Supt. Public Instruction
State of Washington
Executive Director Task Force on Women and Girls in Education
Old Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

Dr. Paula Silver
Associate Director
University Council for Educational Administration
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Dr. Anita Simon, Director
Humanizing Learning Program
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130

Joan Thompson
Federal Women's Program
Office of Education, Room 2049
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20520

Jean A. Wells
Special Assistant to the Director
Women's Bureau
Employment Standards Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, DC 20210

Elizabeth C. Wilson
Consultant Curriculum
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland

Dr. Sara Goodman Zimet
Assistant Professor of Psychology
University of Colorado
Medical Center
4200 East 9th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80220

STAFF:

Margery Thompson
Conference Coordinator and Editor
3400 Dent Place, NW
Washington, DC 20007

June Frank
Conference Secretary
Institute for Educational
Leadership
George Washington University
1001 Connecticut Avenue, NW #310
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. E. Joseph Schneider
1518 K Street, NW, Suite 206
Washington, DC

Maggie Kennedy Burton
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 775
Denver, Colorado 80203

GUEST SPEAKER:

Dr. Wendell Pierce
Education Commission of the
States
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (EPFP) (formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policy-making they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

Since 1965, the program has placed over 250 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who are themselves key actors in public policy issues, agree to serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the State or national level. An important ingredient of the program is the informal weekly seminars through which Fellows interact with decision-makers, eminent authorities and leading specialists in education-related fields. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policy-making. Fellows' salaries are paid by the sponsoring organizations, while the costs of recruitment, placement and continuing professional development are borne by the EPF Program. Headquartered in Washington with sites in four States, the EPF Program is designed for mid-career persons 25-45 years of age who have completed their academic training. Two-thirds of the forty-five participants in 1975-76 have completed the doctorate degree; all have demonstrated substantial leadership skills and a strong commitment to improving the educational system.

Although EPFP participants are widely considered to be prime candidates for excellent post-Fellowship positions, the EPF Program does not commit itself to obtaining future employment for them. Fellows frequently take leaves of absence from their pre-Fellowship position to participate in the program.

Illinois Coordinator—Robert Bunnell
Massachusetts Coordinator—Ursula Wagener
Michigan Coordinators—Carl Candoli & Matthew Prophet

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR (ESS) is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government in the field of education. The goals of ESS are to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how things actually operate in the field; and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional relationships.

ESS supplements the Washington work experience with a variety of in-service training seminars and in-the-field observation. It was established in 1969 and is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the governmental agencies served.

In fiscal year 1975, ESS conducted 73 programs for over 2200 Federal employees. Included were 16 field trips and 57 luncheon/dinner discussion meetings, site visits, demonstrations, and other executive development activities.

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM (TAP) is an evolving IEL activity whose emphasis up to now has been the provision of seminars and other forums for legislators and other policy-makers at State capitals. Begun in 1972 with three State educational seminars, TAP now sponsors 21 seminars, all manned by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 5-10 programs annually.

Other TAP efforts—

Maintain a network of State-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among Federal and State education policy-setters.

Encourage similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of State-level decision-making.

Support attempts of individual State leaders (governors, chief state school officers, legislative committees, etc.) to improve policy-making machinery and to narrow the communications gap which separates political and professional leaders.

OTHER IEL ACTIVITIES

Under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, IEL has established an issue development service for consideration and transmission of key policy issues in postsecondary education. The **POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY (PECA)** sponsors conferences, research efforts, task force groups and publications focusing on such issues as institutional licensing, consumer protection, and State financing. During 1975-76 the program will add lifelong learning and public policy to its agenda.

IEL and National Public Radio co-produce the **"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION"** series, heard weekly over NPR's 179 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the 1-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum cost. In 1974 "Options" received awards from the Education Writers Association and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Mason-Dixon Division. Funds for "Options in Education" are provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Robert S. Clark Foundation, NPR, and other grantors.

Under contract from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, IEL is planning major conference activity early in 1976 for educational decision-makers and administrators on the subject of institutional adjustment to changing sex roles. The goals of the **NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION,** which include increasing training and career options for women in education and facilitating Title IX implementation, will be pursued in cooperation with women's group leaders, policy-makers and the educational community generally.

The **CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT (CEPP)** addresses the issues of education, work and society. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, CEPP uses the resources of other IEL programs—ESS, TAP, "Option"—to inform both policy-makers and the public of the issues in the career education movement.